

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
78 K.W., et al.,
9 Plaintiffs,
10 v.
11 EPIC GAMES, INC.,
12 Defendant.Case No. [21-cv-00976-CRB](#)**ORDER GRANTING UNOPPOSED
MOTION TO DISMISS**

13 The Court GRANTS Defendant Epic Games, Inc.'s unopposed motion to dismiss
14 this action. Mot. (dkt. 52). To determine whether Plaintiffs' claims are precluded by a
15 state court judgment, the Court looks to the claim preclusion rules of the relevant state.
16 See Hesse v. Sprint Corp., 595 F.3d 581, 587 (9th Cir. 2010). Plaintiffs participated in a
17 nationwide class settlement with Epic Games in North Carolina state court. See Zanca v.
18 Epic Games, Inc., No. 21-CVS-534 (N.C. Super. Ct., Wake County). The settlement is
19 final, and all appeals have been withdrawn. See Jacobson Decl. (dkt. 52-1) ¶ 2 & Ex. A.
20 All parties agree that, under North Carolina law, the Settlement Agreement releases the
21 claims Plaintiffs raised in this case. See Mot. at 2, Jacobson Decl. Ex. B (Settlement
22 Agreement). This case is therefore DISMISSED with prejudice.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 Dated: May 2, 2022

25 CHARLES R. BREYER
26 United States District Judge
27
28